

RWANDA ASSESSMENT VISIT
Displaced Children and Orphans Fund

John Williamson
and
Catherine Savino

January 27 - February 10, 1996

The evaluation report was conducted under the auspices of the United States Agency for International Development. The evaluation was conducted by the Displaced Children and Orphans Fund and War Victims Fund Contract (Project No. 936-6004.59) of TvT Associates, Contract No. HRN-6004-C-00-5004. The opinions expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of TvT Associates.

**Additional information or copies of this report can be obtained by contacting:
Displaced Children and Orphans Fund and War Victims Fund Project
1601 N. Kent Street, Suite 1104
Arlington, VA 22209
(703) 516-9166**

B

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations	i
Introduction	1
Background	3
The team's visit	3
Current Issues Concerning Separated Children	5
Coordinated Strategy for Grass-roots Economic Initiatives	9
Information Exchange and Coordination	9
The SC-US Psychosocial Assistance Program	11
Statistical Indicators	13
Progress Against Objectives	15
Additional Activities	19
Observations from Site Visits	20
SCF-UK's IDTR Activities	23
Activities of Rwandan NGOs	27
UNICEF's CEDC Unit	29
Additional Issues	31
Roles and Responsibilities	31
Foster Care	31
Child-Headed Households	33
Preventing Separation during Repatriation	33
Recommendations	35
Appendices	
Appendix 1: Scope of Work	
Appendix 2: Itinerary	
Appendix 3: List of Rwandan children centers	
Endnotes	

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

DCOF	Displaced Children and Orphans Fund
GOR	Government of Rwanda
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
FHI	Food for the Hungry International
IDTR	Identification, Documentation, Tracing and Reunification
MIFAPROFE	Ministry of the Family and Women's Promotion
MINIJUMA	Ministry of Youth and Cooperatives
MINIJUST	Ministry of Justice
MINIREISO	Ministry of Rehabilitation and Social Reintegration
MINISANTE	Ministry of Health
MINTRASO	Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs
NGO	Nongovernmental organization
SCF-UK	Save the Children Fund of the United Kingdom
SC-US	Save the Children Federation of the United States
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

Introduction

As Rwanda struggles to recover from genocide, there are no simple "solutions" to be found. The most one can hope for are ways to improve the situation. Between 500,000 and one million people were brutally killed, the social fabric of the country was shredded, and the faith of the people in the country's institutions was betrayed. There is a categorical difference between the aftermath of a genocide and the situations of armed conflict that international relief and rehabilitation bodies are accustomed to dealing with. Lessons learned following situations of armed conflict, if applicable to Rwanda at all, must be tested and used with extreme caution.

With the volatile situation in Burundi to the south, almost two million Rwandan refugees on the borders, and the former regime and much of its army anticipating renewing the war, it is far from certain that the emergency is over. Tens of thousands of citizens accused of participating in the genocide are imprisoned but there is not yet any process to exercise justice. An international tribunal has been established but has done little. Without justice, how can society and its members move on?

At a time when coordination and collaboration are especially important to shape and direct programs to benefit separated and other vulnerable children, there is a regrettable lack of information sharing and exchange among the nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) concerned. The most active discussions among them concern issues such as the government's registration process and import duties. Although these are legitimate areas of concern, there is little exchange concerning the reasons NGOs are in the country: the situation of children, families, and communities and the program activities intended to benefit them.

Against these discouraging aspects of the situation, there are remarkable signs of hope. Community-based associations with self-help and benevolent goals are starting to emerge. Schools have begun to function again. Scouts, traditional dance groups, and other organizations for children and youth are active. NGO programs are operating in and helping to improve people's lives. Though signs of trauma are present, they are much less evident than in the months following the killing. Children and adults are actively going about the business of coping and

rebuilding. About 12,000 separated children have been reunited with their parents or relatives.¹ The new government is developing structures needed to promote the well-being of children and families. Remarkable individuals are accomplishing a great deal with few material resources (see SEVOTA, p.27).

There appears to be a window of opportunity in Rwanda, and if peace can hold, the action in the next year will shape the future of separated children for years to come. More than 8,000 children remain in 66 orphanage-like centers (see Annex 1), and many times this number are living with foster families scattered throughout the country. As bureaucratic systems are becoming established, however, the window is beginning to close. Unless the government of Rwanda (GOR), across all the various ministries concerned, makes a clear and firm commitment to reduce significantly the number of centers and to reunite or place in foster families as many children as possible, the number of children in centers seems likely to decrease only a bit further and then to reach a balance between children leaving and those being admitted. As international concern for the situation in Rwanda fades, support to run the centers will decline, and with it the quality of care.

The term "separated children" is used in this report, rather than "unaccompanied children," to make it clear that the discussion refers to children who are separated from their parents or normal guardians, whether they are living with a family other than their own, in a center, in a child-headed household, or on the street. Although the technical definition of "unaccompanied children" essentially means the same thing, it more literally suggests just those children who are without adult accompaniment.

Foster family care is likely to be a good option only for those adolescents who want it. Others are likely to resist integration in a family other than their own and to resent the work they would be expected to perform as a part of it. For them, supervised independent living along with apprenticeships or some other form of skills training may be a better option.

Along with a firm commitment to placing at least younger children in family care (their own or foster families), there must be a commitment to strengthening the capacities of families and communities to care for the most vulnerable children. This includes not only such income enhancement measures as village banking and agricultural cooperatives, but also increasing awareness and understanding of children's needs and rights. It is important that communities see themselves as responsible for protecting and promoting the well-being of the most vulnerable children and families. This is a major social mobilization task that the GOR and NGOs must continue actively to pursue.

BACKGROUND

This visit to Rwanda was funded through the Displaced Children and Orphans Fund (DCOF), contract number HRN-6004-C-00-5004. In response to the genocide of April 1994, the DCOF provided a one-year \$1,000,000 grant to UNICEF to support psychosocial activities and identification, documentation, tracing, and reunification of separated children in Rwanda. UNICEF distributed \$451,065 to Save the Children Federation of the United States (SC-US) and \$282,268 to the Save the Children Fund of the United Kingdom (SCF-UK).

In February 1995 DCOF technical advisers Gene Chiavarolli and Rob Robertson visited Rwanda to participate in a review of new proposals and report on the status of the UNICEF grant. Based on their recommendations and in conjunction with USAID/Rwanda, the decision was made to continue funding activities in Rwanda, but through individual NGOs rather than through UNICEF.

At the time of the visit, the only activity directly supported by DCOF funds was the SC-US Psychosocial Assistance Program, funded for \$649,988 from 10/1/95 through 9/30/96.

THE TEAM'S VISIT

The team members were Cathy Savino of the Displaced Children and Orphans Fund contract and John Williamson, a technical adviser to DCOF. They visited Rwanda January 27-February 10, 1996, to review USAID-funded projects for separated children in the country as well as broader issues related to the current and future situation of this group. Their scope of work is included as Appendix 1 and their itinerary as Appendix 2.

This trip was initiated by an invitation from SC-US to participate in a "lessons learned" meeting with their counterparts from Mozambique and Zimbabwe. The first half of the team's visit, January 29-February 3, focused on the Psychosocial Assistance Program of SC-US and included visits to four of the centers for separated children in which the group is working and to six of the community associations it has helped to develop. The second half of the visit also focused on separated children: the documentation, tracing, and family reunification program of SCF-UK; the plans, activities, and capacity of the GOR; UNICEF's plans and activities; and the current and potential involvement of Rwandan NGOs. To provide a broader context for understanding the situation of separated children in the country and action for their benefit, the team also visited components of the programs of Food for the Hungry and World Vision and talked with the staff of Red Barnet.

The activities reviewed in this report fall under the Assistance to Displaced Persons Project in the USAID Rwanda mission. The purpose of the project is to contribute to the well-being of

Rwanda Assessment Visit

displaced Rwandans in camps and those returning home in ways that enhance their long-term productivity and welfare at home. The structure of this project allows flexibility for working with both government and NGOs, which anticipates both capacity-building and income-generating activities. The initial target population is unaccompanied and separated children. Subsequent phases are likely to be more broadly focussed. Details of this project are as follows:

Project No.:	696-0148
Life of Project:	\$9 million
PACD:	9/30/99
Grantees:	
Care:	\$1,414,140 (expired)
SC-US:	\$649,988 10/1/95 - 9/30/96

The team did not attempt to evaluate the programs it visited. Rather, the purpose was to review what has been done with a view toward suggesting future action by the mission and possible support by DCOF.

Current Issues Concerning Separated Children

In December 1995 there were 8,303 children living in 66 centers for separated children within the country (see Appendix 3). The director of the Department of Social Affairs said that the number had been about 15,000 in early 1995.² The centers visited all continue to accept new children. Although mass tracing by SCF-UK and International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) continues to produce results, the team was concerned that progress in moving children out of centers for family reunion or foster placement may eventually stall due to concern about placing children in poor families and the tendency of children's institutions to perpetuate themselves.

No current activity regarding foster placement was apparent in the centers visited. This can be attributed at least in part to uncertainty about the requirements the GOR is going to establish regarding the commitments families will have to make for the care of a foster child. There does not appear to be a single focal point for monitoring and guiding foster placements, but perhaps this will be established by future legislation concerning the care of separated children. Though the Engagement d'Accueil (fostering agreement) was signed on June 16, 1995 by MIFAPROFE, it left major points unclarified thus effectively ruling out implementation.

An Interministerial Task Force, including MINITRASO, MIFAPROFE, MINIREISO, and MINIJUST, as well as technical support from SCF-UK, was reported to have developed draft legislation for regulating the residential centers for children. The team was informed that the document was being rewritten or put into legal language and would be presented to Parliament in the near future. It was not possible to review this document, or to assess its likelihood of passage but the proposed legislation was reported to address issues such as:

- establishing and closing a center
- personnel requirements
- physical facilities
- standards of care, sanctions, and regulations
- government inspection of centers
- documentation, tracing, and family reunification procedures
- foster family placement procedures.

Such legislation and the capacity to implement it are critically needed tools to guide and shape programs and activities intended to benefit separated and orphaned children.

The government's position on minimizing the number of centers and placing children in foster families is being questioned at least informally. Senior officials, while acknowledging the policy that supports placing children in families, indicated concern about the poverty of the households in which children are being reunited or fostered. Staff of SCF-UK indicated that their own social workers are sometimes reluctant to take children from centers to live with families that lack the resources to provide basic material amenities and ensure access to school. They sometimes return from reunifications bringing other children from the community, who have been living with poor foster families, for placement in a center.

Among informants consulted by the team, guesses as to the proportion of children in centers who know where their families are, or vice versa, ranged between one-third and one-half. Many children remain in centers because their parents or relatives want them to be there. There seems to be a significant risk that the number of centers and children in them will remain high, while international support for these children declines, and with it the quality of care.

International experience with residential centers for children consistently shows that they tend to perpetuate themselves. Vested interests develop, not only among staff but also among businesses that supply them, organizations that run them, groups that contribute to them, and families whose economic burdens are reduced by them. Often, government officials who represent these constituents also actively or passively resist the closing of centers. The children who live in better-equipped centers often do not want to leave and face significantly reduced material surroundings, the necessity of working to meet daily needs, and the prospect of not being able to continue in school.

In the face of these trends, it is important to recall some of the ways in which children who grow up in institutions are disadvantaged. To develop in healthy ways, younger children need an ongoing, caring relationship with a specific adult who is the primary care giver. Such continuity of care is rarely possible in an institution because of staff turnover. Children in institutions generally do not have the same opportunities as other children to learn social and cultural skills, parenting roles, and basic traditional and household skills. They may lack a sense of identity as part of an extended family and community. Also, on reaching adulthood, children who have grown up in an institution often experience serious difficulties in becoming independent and integrating in a community. Accustomed to someone providing for their basic needs, they lack the network of relationships and informal support needed to become self-supporting and to cope with difficult times.

The availability of institutional care tends to erode traditional extended family obligations for caring for orphaned or separated children and to undermine a community's sense of responsibility to its most vulnerable members. If the option of placing children in centers is available, families under strong economic pressure often will use it as a coping mechanism. Institutional care for children is not an effective response to family poverty, however, because the more places that are available in centers, the more children will emerge to fill them. Moreover, institutional care is less cost-effective than building the capacities of families to provide care.

Residential care that even approaches an acceptable level of quality is expensive. A recent review of institutional care for children in the developing world carried out by SCF-UK observed that "residential care is an expensive form of care, bearing in mind the required capital investment as well as recurring costs. As a response to family poverty, residential care is not only inappropriate, but considerably more expensive than the likely costs of helping to support the child with her own family."³ An evaluation in Goma, Zaire, found the yearly cost per child of institutional care to be five times greater than the cost of activities to prevent separation and provide foster care.⁴ In Tanzania a World Bank study found the cost of supporting a child for a year in a state-run orphanage in the capital to be US\$649 and the cost in NGO-run facilities outside the capital to be US\$151 per year.⁵ Institutional care as an option for long-term placement of children seems even less justifiable considering that the psychosocial quality of such care is judged largely by how closely it replicates the care children receive in a family environment.

It must also be recognized that there are worse alternatives for children than living in a center, if it is run well. Children should *not* be pushed out of centers at all costs. Life in an abusive family situation or on the street can be much worse. Also, foster family placement or even care by distant relatives may not be appropriate for some adolescents, who may have difficulties integrating into a family other than their own. For teenagers who cannot be reunified and who do not want to be in a foster family, some form of supervised independent living in small groups may be a better alternative than a center.

It is important that in its monitoring role MINITRASO makes it clear to center managers that all children have a fundamental right to reestablish and maintain links with their families and that children in centers must benefit from the programs established to promote reunification. One approach to reducing the reluctance of center staff to cooperate with such efforts is for centers to continue as a different type of program. For example, SC-US assisted one center to establish a preschool. Others might become community centers or boarding schools, admitting only older children who would live with their families during school breaks. However, the relatively low skill level of most center staff will limit the extent to which they will be able to make such a transition.

In addition to considering the welfare of the children now living in centers, it will become increasingly important for Rwanda to shift from center-based to community-based care for separated and orphaned children as the number of children orphaned by AIDS grows steadily. If centers are available, children will be placed in them yet this is a very expensive way to provide for their care and one that will not be sustainable at the scale the problem is likely to reach.

The problem of children orphaned by AIDS was already beginning to emerge in Rwanda in 1993. The book, *Action for Children Affected by AIDS*, provides an overview of the situation at that time.⁶ The massive displacements and disruptions that have taken place since then can only be expected to have accelerated this emerging problem. Faced with growing numbers of orphans, it is imperative that Rwanda begin as rapidly as possible to strengthen the capacities of families and communities to provide care for its most vulnerable children.

The poverty of many families throughout the country is a serious constraint to their providing fully for their children's needs. Absorbing more children through reunification and fostering can add to their economic burdens. From both child welfare and cost-benefit perspectives, the best strategy is to work on two parallel tracks, promoting family placements while strengthening the capacity of vulnerable families and communities to provide for the needs of their children. It is not appropriate, however, to target development aid to households that are newly receiving a child through reunification or foster placement because this approach can create tensions with families who have spontaneously taken in children other than their own and can result in children being accepted primarily as a means to obtain assistance. But the team did see many examples of cooperative agricultural efforts benefiting vulnerable children and families. Coupled with some of these were training activities to increase awareness of children's psychosocial needs and to promote community responsibility for vulnerable children and families.

Several donors anticipate allocating substantial funding for income-generating initiatives, credit schemes, and other activities to boost family income and productive capacity. Through a coordinated strategy they use these resources to facilitate family and community capacity to accept children in need of care. Assistance to schools also helps build community capacity to provide for children's needs.

Significantly reducing the number of children in centers is both possible and desirable. In Goma the number of children in centers at one point approached 12,000. Through the concerted efforts of UNICEF, UNHCR, and various NGOs, by January 1996 the number was reduced to 1,641.⁷ The relative geographic concentration of the camps, in contrast to the dispersal of centers throughout Rwanda, facilitated family reunification and foster placement efforts, but the possibility in Rwanda of placing children with families living in their own homes and with land to cultivate is an advantage.

Rwanda is at a crossroads concerning the care of its separated and orphaned children. Tracing will not be successful for many now living in centers. And, as noted, the number of children in need of care can be expected to grow because of HIV/AIDS. Either the government and the NGO community can make a serious commitment to family and community-based care, or centers will become solidly established as a major placement option. The numbers of centers and children in them can be reduced through family reunification and foster placements, but an overall strategy and specific plans are needed.

Coordinated Strategy for Grass-roots Economic Initiatives

USAID and other donors interested in supporting grass-roots initiatives to generate income or boost agricultural productive capacity should consult among themselves and with MINITRASO, MIFAPROFE, MINIJUMA, and MINIREISO to develop a coordinated strategy targeting communities close to centers for unaccompanied children to help them more easily absorb and provide for both children reunited with (or simply returned to) their families and those placed in foster care. The ministries, in consultation with donors and NGOs, must define the policies to guide economic initiatives to benefit vulnerable families and children. Implementation of credit schemes and income-generating projects can be done most effectively by national or international NGOs. Ministries can facilitate effective implementation through sensitizing and motivating local government officials who can make available the critical resource of land.

Information Exchange and Coordination

There appears to be very little information exchange or active coordination among NGOs involved with separated children. MINIREISO convenes biweekly meetings focused on this group, but the team concluded from the one meeting it attended and comments on previous meetings that participation is limited and passive. This forum would be much more useful to all concerned if it provided ongoing opportunities for dialogue among senior staff of the social ministries and NGOs on policy issues as well as information exchange about program activities. It would be useful for them regularly to share experiences and lessons learned about issues such as developing innovative approaches to tracing, promoting foster placements, and ensuring follow-up after reunification and foster placement.

Following establishment of a system to register NGOs and the subsequent expulsion from the country of 43 of them in December 1995, there is a climate of uncertainty and tension between NGOs and the GOR. The welfare of Rwanda's vulnerable children can best be served with both parties playing complementary roles. NGOs bring vitally needed financial resources to the country as well as valuable experience and technical skills. Government is properly concerned

with establishing policies to guide their work and monitoring their compliance with these policies. There is understandable resentment on the part of ministry staff who lack the basic supplies, equipment, and vehicles to function effectively, while NGOs are relatively well funded and mobile. Forcing out competent NGOs, however, will not free resources for use by the government because donors have generally come to the view that programs are implemented more effectively by NGOs than by governments.

Coordination among NGOs needs to be addressed at least at two levels. It is the government's responsibility to establish a framework of policies and laws within which they can operate. The GOR can seek to prevent the over-concentration of programs in some areas as well as promote attention to geographic areas and social groups with the greatest unmet needs. It can facilitate the work of NGOs through securing the cooperation and support of local officials. Relevant ministries can convene issue- and task-oriented meetings for collaborative situation analysis, needs assessment, policy development, planning, and (at least at a general level) information exchange. At another level, NGOs need opportunities to share information among themselves and discuss openly mutual concerns.

The SC-US Psychosocial Assistance Program

The team was favorably impressed with the Psychosocial Assistance program of SC-US. The approach and activities observed were appropriate and appeared to be contributing to the well-being of the separated children in the centers and communities where the program has been carried out.

OVERVIEW

The goal of the program is "to promote the capacities of Rwandan communities to respond to the psychosocial needs of Rwandan children. The program's guiding philosophy includes three key elements:

- meeting children's immediate psychosocial needs during and immediately after armed conflict
- supporting the deinstitutionalization of children in residential centers and their placement in safe and nurturing families
- relying on human, cultural, and community resources to promote the health development of children.

In October 1994 the program began in 13 centers for separated children. SC-US was directed to or selected centers around the country that had been identified as being in particular need of psychosocial activities and family reunification efforts. Of the 13, eight were run by local groups and five by international NGOs. Seven had opened in response to the war and genocide, while the others were already operating. The centers were located in eight of the country's 11 préfectures. Through directly organizing activities and training center staff to do so, SC-US provided psychosocial support for children. SC-US did not attempt to measure the degree of traumatization of these children but did observe that many children were initially lethargic and not engaged with what was going on around them. Other anecdotal information suggests that children who have been in the program exhibit fewer overt signs of trauma and are better adjusted when reunited or placed in foster families.

The psychosocial activities initiated did not focus on trauma per se, but on promoting a more positive environment, engaging children in interactive activities, promoting interaction between children and the surrounding community, ensuring school attendance, and improving the ways children received care within the centers. The SC-US field staff, all of whom are Rwandan, were assigned to work in pairs, initially in the centers. As their objectives have been achieved there (or in two cases, where center staff were resistant), they have begun to work in the surrounding communities.

Their approach in the communities has largely involved sensitization, training, and mobilization, rather than the provision of material assistance. Field staff have helped community residents, foster families in particular, to organize associations focused on promoting the welfare of separated children. Many of the associations have concentrated on starting self-help agricultural and animal-raising activities. They meet at least once a month, elect leaders, and establish priorities for activities.

One concern raised the team raised with SC-US staff is that the move from centers into the surrounding communities has left staff scattered throughout the country. Consequently, their impacts are isolated, and supervision is more time-consuming and expensive than if they were more concentrated geographically. It also means relating to and keeping informed many local officials. Finally, it leaves the program operating in communities whose selection was more a consequence of the centers initially chosen, rather than their own particular needs.

Overall, the program seems to be effective and of high quality. It has made a reasonable attempt to achieve the numerical targets specified in its objectives but has fallen short of several of these. In the view of the team, SC-US should review its experience, achievements, and current program in order to find ways to achieve greater numerical impact in a more consolidated geographic area.

Statistical Indicators

The following are some of the key program statistics reported by SC-US in the report on the first year of the psychosocial program:

- 8,568 children *directly* benefit on a regular basis, including 3,204 separated children in centers, 2,384 separated children in communities, and 2,980 other children in communities
 - More than 24,000 children *indirectly* affected by the program
 - 1,276 foster families benefiting from program activities
 - Involvement in 13 centers and 13 communities during the reporting period
 - Involvement in six centers with 962 children at the end of the reporting period
 - 143 collaborating organizations, including 86 Rwandan partners
 - Collaboration with tracing agencies in 12 communities
 - 49 youth activity groups started, with 1,467 members
 - 20 foster family associations started, with 940 members
 - 687 children enrolled in school by program staff
 - More than 2,272 follow-up home visits
 - 979 children regularly receiving follow-up visits
 - 847 Rwandans trained by program staff
 - 191 family reunifications carried out by program staff
 - 232 potential foster families identified by program staff
-

PROGRESS AGAINST OBJECTIVES

Shortly before leaving Rwanda, the team received a draft of SC-US's report on its first year of operation. Because that report systematically addresses progress against the 15 objectives initially established for the program, comments here will be limited to the team's own observations and comments on selected objectives and key issues in the report. Although it was not possible for the team to verify the program achievements quantified in the report, the numbers presented appear consistent with the team's observations, and the team did obtain samples of the forms used to compile program statistics. Unless otherwise indicated, the numbers presented here are taken from the draft report on the program's first 14 months of operation.

I. Psychosocial Intervention Initiatives in Care Centers and Within Immediate Communities

- **Provide direct psychosocial intervention in 12 child care centers involving 4,000 children by training and placing 15 community youth workers.**

SC-US has worked in 13 centers, although the group decided to withdraw at an early stage from two where it became clear center staff were not going to cooperate in program activities or documentation and tracing efforts.⁸ In the reporting period, 3,204 children in these centers were directly engaged in program activities. Achievement of the target of 4,000 direct beneficiaries in centers would have required expanding the program to several additional centers. Twenty-one staff were assigned to the centers in pairs, exceeding the number initially foreseen. Program staff remain active in six centers, with a total of 962 children involved in program activities on a regular basis. Whereas in the early stages of the program SC-US staff were directly involved in organizing activities with children in the centers, they have largely phased out of these roles by training center staff and providing them support and guidance.

An additional 1,510 children in 10 additional centers received more limited benefits from the program through collaboration of SC-US staff with personnel in these centers.

The following are examples of activities organized in the centers:

- age-appropriate developmental activities (for example, teaching children to walk and talk, unstructured play, singing and dancing);
- cultural and spiritual activities (for example, traditional dance, drama, a Rwandan geography game, prayer groups);
- sports and leisure activities (for example, soccer, volleyball, basketball, drawing, arts and crafts, toy-making, counseling, group discussions, scouts and other youth organizations)

- skills-building activities (for example, literacy classes, rabbit raising, gardening, sewing, embroidery, knitting, masonry, carpentry, basketry).
- **Train center staff in psychosocial intervention techniques.**

Program staff organized 112 training sessions (of one to two hours each) for 99 center staff. Topics included:

- recognizing symptoms of trauma in children
- children's psychosocial needs
- child health
- personal hygiene and center sanitation
- nutrition and signs of deficiencies
- listening skill
- child psychology
- schooling as a psychosocial activity
- discipline and setting limits
- integrating new children into a center
- the Convention on the Rights of the Child
- documentation, tracing, and family reunion
- work plans
- center organization.

SC-US field staff have also helped center staff establish individual psychosocial dossiers for the children. To facilitate monitoring of children's school attendance and progress, they have also initiated a system of "communication notebooks" in which teachers write comments on academic performance, behavior at school, attendance, and other matters.

- **Establish linkages between child care centers and surrounding communities.**

SC-US staff have given considerable attention to reducing the isolation of children in centers from their surrounding communities. They have recruited 32 community volunteers, who regularly lead activities in centers. There were more than 150 sports matches involving some 7,000 center and community children and 10 community expositions in which children presented examples of their skills in arts and crafts, traditional dances, songs and other areas. Some 770 center and community children jointly participate in apprenticeships. SC-US staff followed up 519 children from centers who were reunited, placed, or returned to families.

II. Support for Local Community Youth Programs

- **Rejuvenate/support a minimum of three local organizations traditionally providing support to community youth surrounding each child care center where a worker is placed.**

The genocide destroyed the social fabric of communities. In communities particularly affected, to address the critical need to rebuild social institutions and children's trust in them and with particular attention to foster children, SC-US field staff have helped initiate community-based activities such as Scouts and Girl Guides, church-based youth groups, dance troops, sports teams, committees of foster children, literacy programs, and apprenticeships. Some 1,467 community children and youth participate in 49 ongoing groups or activities. To help promote the sustainability of such activities, SC-US staff have collaborated with 140 local and international NGOs and other groups.

- **Involve a minimum of 6,000 community youth in organized psychosocial programs.**

The number of community children involved during the reporting period probably exceeded 6,000. Those who could be counted most easily in the communities where SC-US is working were 2,384 separated children living with families and the 2,980 biological children of the same families, a total of 5,364 (the natural children of foster families are routinely included in activities for separated children). SC-US also carried out a survey which revealed that 1,506 children were involved in activities in an average week. These are in addition to the 3,204 children living in centers who have benefited regularly from the program's psychosocial activities.

III. Identification of and Support for Substitute Families

Although recognizing the poverty of many of the families with whom they work, SC-US field staff have operated on the principle that the community must build on its own strengths and resources (human, financial, and material) to address the needs of its most vulnerable members. The SC-US' report notes that the first community meetings have never been a success for program staff because of resident's expectations of receiving material assistance. The report indicates that it is usually not until the fourth meeting that a few individuals express a willingness to try this approach. These individuals have become the core of the foster family and community associations that SC-US has helped to start.

- **Assist in placing over 600 children in substitute families by training and placing nine Documentation, Tracing, and Reunification Officers in communities surrounding the child care centers.**

The original intent of the objective is not clear because it refers to documentation, tracing, and reunification and to placement of children in substitute families (that is, families other than those with whom they lived before April 1994), two complementary but different activities. Because SCF-UK and the ICRC have primary responsibility in identification, documentation, tracing, and reunification (IDTR), the activities of SC-US in this area have been largely to sensitize center directors and community members to the importance of reuniting children with families and ensuring that children in centers have been documented. SC-US has also identified separated children living in communities in need of priority attention for tracing and has done follow-up monitoring of children reunited in the communities where it is working.

Nonetheless, SC-US and the International Rescue Committee carried out a special project in one center that resulted in the reunification of 74 children. Staff assigned to the Fred Rwigema Center in the Rwamagana community found that many of the children had family members in the surrounding community and one field staff member was assigned to the effort. Given the assumption by many that a significant proportion of the children in centers know where family members are living, this type of center-based family reunification effort, incorporating the type of family mediation approach used in Goma, would make sense.

With regard to the placement of children with substitute families, this objective was not achieved. Because of the level of uncertainty among potential foster families about the implications of pending government regulations on their obligations to foster children (for example, to ensure schooling, health care, and other services), SC-US senior staff decided that they could not pursue such placement until regulations are established and made public. They have, however, sensitized community members to the need of children in centers for foster care and carried out focus group research designed to help them better understand the motivation and requirements of families caring for children other than their own.

- **Develop community networks responsible for monitoring unaccompanied children.**

Although progress has been made, this very important objective remains to be achieved. It took most of the first year to establish community associations, the primary focus of which has been economic initiatives. It is reported, however, that many of the associations have formed committees to monitor the situation of separated children in their communities. The program will be collecting information on the number of follow-up visits made. The team will share with SC-US reports on community monitoring initiatives in Zimbabwe, whose experiences and lessons learned might be useful in Rwanda. One concern, however, is that SC-US is considering

paying modest amounts into the community funds of associations for each child followed up. Although this approach might produce results in the short run, it would likely undermine the development of sustainable community-based monitoring systems.

IV. Training

- **Conduct a minimum of 36 formal two-day training workshops involving approximately 720 participants.**

SC-US fell short of the anticipated number of two-day training sessions and participants. It has distinguished the formal training organized by the program's trainer and senior staff from the semi-formal training conducted by staff assigned in centers or communities. Formal training was typically of a longer duration. Of the formal training sessions, 15 lasted two or more days and involved a total of 390 participants. An additional 20 formal training sessions involving another 138 participants were carried out. In addition, 267 community members and center personnel took part in informal training, which usually lasted less than a day.

- **Provide indirect assistance to an additional 5,000-8,000 children through these training programs.**

SC-US only began to collect information on the number of children indirectly benefiting from its training in September 1995. For the training events of two or more days during the period September-December, there were six participants and a total of 586 indirect child beneficiaries, a ratio of 1:98. Considering that 390 people took part in training of two or more days during the entire period, the ratio of participants to indirect beneficiaries would have only to have been only 1:13 to have reached the stated objective. Though not technically included in the objective, the number of children indirectly benefiting from this training plus the formal training of less than two days and the informal training would be much greater than the stated objective. One significant impact of training by the program was that 300 children were reunited by 60 social workers who had been trained by SC-US.

ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES

In addition to the activities for which objectives were specified, the SC-US program also worked with the national NGO, HAGURUKA, to translate the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child into Kinyarwanda. SC-US reports having provided a consultant for four months to MIFAPROFE to train its personnel in survey research. SC-US also provided basic computer training for staff of the same ministry.

OBSERVATIONS FROM SITE VISITS

The Abadatenguha Urwejo (Rwanda of Tomorrow) association in the Tumba community of Butare was particularly impressive. Its membership included 255 households that are caring for a total of 467 separated children. The association has seven sub-groups, each focused on a particular activity, such as agriculture, rabbit and chicken raising, arts and crafts, and training.

The association had recently held a community celebration with some 3,000 participants to showcase their accomplishments, display children's arts and crafts projects, and encourage others to become involved. Presentations stressed the need to take in and provide care for separated children and emphasized the needs and rights of these children. The celebration included dancing, games and sports, and a special ceremony to thank foster families.

The association reported having a system for monitoring the situation of foster children and helping families to solve problems, such as children dropping out of school. Members of the association's steering committee estimated that about 30 percent of the roughly 800 families in Tumba Secture are caring for children other than their own. The association has established a fund that is used to meet special needs of the foster children and families. At the time of the team's visit, it had accumulated FR26,000 (about \$87US), mostly through the monthly dues paid by members.

A subsequent visit to the Abashiahmwé (Those Who Are Come Together) association that SC-US had helped to start in the Ngoma-Matyazu community of Butare in May 1995 was instructive in a different way. While visiting the fish ponds and agricultural plots the association was using, members of a newer association that SC-US was also helping organize came to argue for the right to use some of the land. Competition for land can be expected to become much more intense if and when refugees begin to return in large numbers.

All of the several community associations visited had started cooperative agricultural or animal-raising projects. They included foster families, but typically included a minority of families without foster children who had received training and been sensitized to the particular needs of foster children and families. Each had established, largely through monthly dues and contributions, a fund to help meet special needs of foster children and families. Although in communities particularly hard hit by the genocide and armed war, between 30 percent and 80 percent of families in these areas were caring for children other than their own. The origin of the children in foster care differed among the communities. In some, many of the foster children had come from other parts of the country, having been separated during the massive displacements of population. In others, most of the children were from the area and the situation of their parents was known.

Malaria was cited as the most significant health problem at almost all of the sites visited. Although one of the associations in Kigali has started a clinic primarily to treat malaria, no prevention or control efforts were cited by any of the groups with which SC-US is working. There appears to be a significant need for technical assessment in relation to this health issue.

SCF-UK's IDTR Activities

SCF-UK is the lead agency for IDTR activities for separated children in Rwanda. It collaborates closely with the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), with which it signed an agreement in May 1995 defining their respective IDTR responsibilities in the country. The SCF-UK grant has been funded by UNICEF (with USAID funds) and OFDA. The last award was in May 1995 for \$282,468; the grant goes through July 1996. It is anticipated that SCF-UK will seek additional funds from donors for FY 97. In June 1996 both SCF-UK and the ICRC will evaluate their efforts to date. That review is expected to provide information on program impact, the extent of work that remains to be done, and each organization's future commitment. SCF-UK's overall operation is effective, especially since it adopted a mass tracing approach in June 1995.

SCF-UK took the lead in documenting the separated children living in centers, and the ICRC has responsibility for documenting children arriving since the joint agreement was signed. The ICRC is also responsible for following the movement of separated children into and out of the centers. SCF-UK and its NGO partners have the principal responsibility for carrying out reunifications of separated children within Rwanda, while the ICRC concentrates on cross-border reunifications. Each organization maintains its own database on separated children and exchanges new information with the other. With regard to mass tracing, the two organizations have divided between themselves responsibility for covering all the communes within each préfecture.

With the closer collaboration of these two agencies and by using active tracing methods, the number of reunifications has increased. Since the program began in June 1995, SCF-UK reports that 3,284 children have been reunited through assistance with this program, which represents 20 percent of the total caseload in Rwanda at the time of the team's visit. Though all methods of tracing are being used, mass tracing, which lists children by their commune of origin to trace relatives, has been most successful. That said, SCF-UK is still documenting up to 2,000 children per month. Thus reliance on any one method, even mass tracing, is not sufficient. Use of a variety of tracing methods in collaboration with other organizations appears to offer the most effective strategy.

Mass tracing uses the information collected by both the ICRC and SCF-UK to produce lists of children by commune of origin. SCF-UK works with local authorities to arrange a date for the meeting. Local authorities then publicize the meeting, and on the appointed day those people looking for their children gather. When the SCF-UK staff arrives, they meet with people in small

groups and read the names of the children and each parent, if known. If a name is recognized, information is collected, verified, and if positive identification is made, a plan for reunification is arranged.

The ICRC and SCF-UK both collect data, have different databases and produce separate lists based on the child's place of origin. The collaboration of the ICRC and SCF-UK has meant better results. One result of the collaboration that resulted in more children being identified was the use of the father's name. Initially, when the ICRC began mass tracing, it used only the mother's name an ineffective approach since Rwandan women primarily use their husband's name. The ICRC was initially concerned about security related to use of the father's name, but those concerns have been largely allayed. According to one example, using just the mother's name resulted in positive identification for only 10 of 100 children. Using the father's name, the number who recognized a name jumped to 70 of 100.

Seventy communes have been covered using the mass tracing method, or about half of the country. Meetings were originally held three times a week, but the logistics of planning and traveling for these events as well as the work generated after each meeting made that schedule impractical. The plan now calls for two mass tracing meetings a week.

SCF-UK operates with a staff of 55, eight of whom are expatriates. It appears that SCF-UK is well regarded by the government although the team could not confirm this with the relevant ministries. SCF-UK served as facilitator of the Interministerial Task Force on Unaccompanied Children that prepared draft legislation concerning children's centers around the country. SCF-UK is aware that it works at the pleasure of the GOR and reports making efforts to keep communication lines open and all parties well informed.

Lack of consistent provision for follow-up monitoring of children who have been reunited is a concern, however. This should be an integral part of an IDTR program whose focus is separated children. Conceptually, SCF-UK staff have made an inappropriate distinction between IDTR and "social work" activities, which they see as beyond the scope of what they can realistically do. Even though the size of the caseload is admittedly very large, where children are the focus of a program that involves family placement (with parents, relatives, and others), basic child welfare standards should be applied. Experience with family reunification for separated children in many other situations points to the likelihood that some placements will break down, even when careful verification has been done. Indeed, anecdotal information suggests that at least a few of the Rwandan reunited children are either returning to the centers or leaving home altogether.

SCF-UK staff should not necessarily make the follow-up visits themselves, but they should consistently seek to ensure that at least two visits are made within the first four months after placement. There are several possibilities for arranging for follow-up: through other NGOs

(Rwandan or international); commune-level staff of MINITRASO or local officials (Bourgemeistres, Conseillers, and Responsables); community associations SCF-UK staff. Visitors should determine at a minimum, whether children have remained with the family, ensure that children have not been abused, seek to mobilize action or local resources where serious problems are identified, and provide feedback to SCF-UK on their findings. Although SCF-UK has arranged follow-up visits for some of the children who have been reunited, but the concern is that staff have seen this measure as optional rather than integral to their program.

Another concern is the degree to which SCF-UK field personnel are trained to minimize children's distress caused by the interviewing process. Some attention is given to this issue in staff training. Appropriately, SCF-UK training material indicates:

When arriving to do the documentation the interviewers may want to spend some time playing with the children to establish a rapport. And also to explain to the children what they are doing there. The interviewer would also introduce him/herself before beginning the interview. Remind the participants that the purpose is to help the child to relax and to create an atmosphere of trust that the child can talk freely....

The documentation is now complete, however it is not simply a question of saying goodbye to the child and moving on to the next one. The interviewer must give the child time. Reassure him/her that you will be doing your best to find someone. Take him/her back to one of the care givers. Both of you join with a game that is going on, etc.

Unaccompanied Children in Emergencies: A Field Guide for Their Care and Protection includes additional guidance:

- Interviews are best conducted early in the day when they will be followed by other activities for the child. It is thoughtless to ask a child to recount painful memories late in the day and then leave him or her to a night of nightmares and sleeplessness...
- Include an adult close to the child in the closing conversation so the child is left with someone to talk to about feelings and memories the interview may bring up.
- At the end of the questioning, allow the child to take over the interview by asking questions and interviewing the interviewer. Ask the child's opinions or ideas about something--in other words, listen and show interest in the child and allow him or her to gain control of the conversation.

Finally, in an interview, the first responsibility is to the child, no matter how intense the pressure to obtain information or how difficult the answers are to get. It is the feelings and action of the child that will determine the tone of the interview, and the child's need to stop must be respected.⁹

Activities of Rwandan NGOs

Regrettably, the team was not able to devote as much time as it would have liked to exploring the current and potential activities of Rwandan NGOs in relation to the needs of separated children and orphans. SC-US reported having worked with many local organizations and strong partnerships with three or four. The team was informed that the few national-level Rwandan NGOs that exist are receiving sufficient funding and support for specific activities but not receiving much to develop their core administrative capacity. A reported constraint to the development of new NGOs is a lengthy process in order to receive official government recognition, which is necessary to establish a bank account.

This situation presents a dilemma for donors. Funding international NGOs is likely to be the quickest way to achieve results, but building sustainable approaches requires the slower process of developing local capacities. The latter seems particularly important in Rwanda today. One of the most important roles that international NGOs and donors can play will be to help initiate and strengthen local and national NGOs.

One visit to a local NGO suggested the potential of this approach. SEVOTA (Structure d'Encadrement des Veuves et des Orphelins de la Commune Taba) in Gitarama préfecture was started by Ms. Mukasarasi Godelieva in December 1994. She is the social assistant with MINITRASO assigned to the commune and is a member of Réseau des Femmes (Rwanda's first women's NGO). She credited Réseau des Femmes with creating SEVOTA. Initially she conducted a survey of widows and orphans in the commune. Then she began organized the widows into groups of 10 to 30 to carry out self-help projects. At the time of the team's visit, she reported that there were a total of 1,260 women in 72 groups engaged in agricultural activities, raising small animals, and credit and savings.

In April 1995 she began to organize the orphans and separated children living in the commune. She had identified 976 "orphans" (age 22 years and younger) in the commune, and at the time of the visit said 546 of them, or members of their foster families, had been organized into groups engaged in the same types of activities as the widows. She said also that SEVOTA organizes sports activities for these young people every Saturday. SEVOTA also organized training in areas such as agriculture (the agronomist for the commune is a member), animal raising, sexually transmitted diseases and AIDS, trauma, peace, and the design and management of small projects.

According to Ms. Godelieva, the only outside support that SEVOTA has received was money for goat raising from Assist and training from Terre des Hommes. She also said she had received training on trauma, presumably through the National Trauma Center.

To develop further, SEVOTA's needs include:

- a motorcycle
- new ideas and related training
- additional workers
- a room for training and meetings.

With a modest amount of outside support, SEVOTA should be able to accomplish even more. It strongly suggests the potential for the development of Rwandan NGOs.

UNICEF's CEDC

The team was asked to determine the effectiveness of UNICEF as a focal point for programs assisting unaccompanied children. Within Kigali's office, responsibility in this area falls to the Unit for Children in Especially Difficult Circumstances (CEDC) headed by Lori Calvo, who arrived in Rwanda relatively recently. UNICEF CEDC staff was not at full compliment at the time of the visit; the position directly responsible for separated children was vacant. However, the position was filled after the visit.

There continues to be an important role for UNICEF to play in coordinating NGOs, disseminating information, and helping the GOR develop effective policies for children. The CEDC Unit has four areas of responsibility: the trauma program (Leila Gupta), unaccompanied children (the position recently filled), protection for child soldiers and prisoners (Ray Torres), and overall responsibility for the unit (Ms. Calvo). At the time of the visit, Ms. Calvo was working with the GOR to develop policies concerning separated children and a related action plan. UNICEF was also reviewing the level of funding requested by the GOR for specific projects.

Recently, the Trauma Recovery Program published the "UNICEF Survey on the Exposure to War Related Violence Among Rwandan Children and Adolescents." The survey found that more than two-thirds of the more than 3,000 children interviewed saw someone being injured or killed, 80% experienced a death in their immediate families due to to war, and more than half had witnessed massacres and people being injured or killed with pangas (machetes). Over 80% said they had to hide to protect themselves, and more than half of these said they had to hide for at least four weeks. Sixteen percent reported they had to hide under dead bodies to survive the genocide.

While the study does help convey the extent to which children have been exposed to horrific events, it seems to have limited value as a guide to programming. It would have been useful to measure the extent to which the affects of exposure to violence may have been mitigated by what happened to children subsequently (e.g. family care, social support, opportunities to attend school or participate regularly in recreation or structured play activities, providing opportunities for children to talk about their traumatic experiences).

Additional Issues

The mission asked the team to address several issues concerning foster care and the prevention of separations during repatriation.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Both MINITRASO and MIFAPROFE, the ministries with which the team had direct contact, are in process of creating themselves. Both are developing policies and plans as well as putting new staff in place. Capacity building is a major concern to both ministries, both training for staff and securing needed supplies and equipment. Through targeted assistance to these ministries, USAID can help Rwanda develop systems to protect and provide appropriate care for vulnerable children.

The concerns and mandates of the two ministries overlap, and because they are still in a formative stage, their respective roles in addressing children's issues are not yet clear. Both ministries, for example, are interested in strengthening family economic capacity to care for vulnerable children. This is complicated further by the fact that the Ministry of Youth and Cooperatives also has responsibilities in this area. The current lack of clarity over roles leaves donors and NGOs uncertain about who to work with on which issues, but this uncertainty is understandable considering how recently this government came into being. Hopefully, uncertainties about roles and responsibilities will be clarified through interministerial discussions and planning.

FOSTER CARE

The exact number of children separated or orphaned by the war and genocide is not known, but it is certainly very large. In five communes of Gisenyi alone, Food for the Hungry International (FHI), has identified more than 8,000 children living with families other than their own. Throughout the country, practically all of these cases of foster care are spontaneous. Few children have been intentionally placed. People saw children without care and took them into their homes.

In documents discussing children in foster care and in discussions during the visit, no distinction was generally made between children taken in by members of their extended family and those taken in by others. Because of the traditional obligations carried by family ties, children living with relatives would generally be expected to be in a better situation than others, but this may not always be the case. Even before 1994 the intense population and economic pressures in the country had led to some erosion of the traditional obligations carried by family ties. An assessment comparing the situation of children taken in by extended family members with that of children in the care of families to whom they are not related would be helpful for guiding foster care policy.

In the absence of such research or more comprehensive monitoring, it must be assumed that children in foster care find themselves in a range of situations--from being well cared for to being exploited and abused. The general sense gleaned from many discussions during the visit is that most children in foster care are well taken care of, within the means of the families concerned. The poverty of many families is a concern raised particularly by contacts at MINITRASO and MIFAPROFE. The risks children face are not only immediate, however. Many children (limited to boys under current law) are in a position to inherit the property of their parents. Foster children face the risk that a family providing care may take such assets for their own use. Extensive attention is likely to be needed to protecting the inheritance rights of orphans throughout the country. Any assessment of the situation of foster children should devote attention to the issue of inheritance.

Where foster children are well cared for, they will form emotional bonds with the foster family. Where tracing is ultimately successful and reunification is to be made in another part of the country, such ties will be severed. In some cases foster parents have accompanied a child being moved for family reunification, easing the emotional stress of the transition for both the child and the foster parents.

The "best interests of the child" principle must always guide decisions about family reunification. As time goes on, the emotional ties children have formed with foster families become an increasingly important consideration, particularly where a request for reunification is from a relative whom a child does not know. Age is a significant factor since the care provider of a younger child becomes the "psychological parent" more quickly than for an older child able to remember and maintain a sense of attachment to the natural parent or other family members. Another factor that must be included in the "best interests" equation, however, is the lifelong importance of extended family ties. In Rwanda the de facto social safety net for most people is still the extended family. Reestablishing and maintaining such connections is very important from a psychosocial perspective and also might have a bearing on a child's inheritance.

CHILD-HEADED HOUSEHOLDS

Almost 2,200 children living on their own without adult care have been documented but this almost figure almost certainly is only a portion of the actual number. In some cases such children may have relatives elsewhere but have decided to occupy their parent's property in order to retain it. In addition to poverty and basic needs for food, clothing, shelter, and schooling, the need for legal and social protection is also evident for these households. Most are lead by adolescent girls, who are at special risk since they do not have full rights as adults. There is no mechanism for follow up or any specific programs for these children.

PREVENTING SEPARATIONS DURING REPATRIATION

It seems likely that most of the refugees now in Zaire and Tanzania will return to Rwanda. The questions are when and how. An October 1995 report on Rwandan refugees by Jeff Drumtra of the U.S. Committee for Refugees identified six scenarios for the repatriation of refugees from Zaire, each of them problematic in its own way. Government ministries, international organizations, and NGOs have given attention to ways to prevent separations in the event of large repatriation movements. The December 4, 1995, issue of *Children: The Future of Rwanda*, the UNICEF-supported newsletter of MINTRASO, provides an overview of the draft Operational Plan of the Unaccompanied Children's Cell of HACU/UNHCR that includes preparation in countries of exile, reception in Rwanda, and reintegration in communes. SCF-UK has distributed leaflets to sensitize families about preventing separations during repatriation and to inform workers of procedures they should follow to prevent separations and ensure proper attention to separated children.

The visit to Gisenyi included a stop at the Nkamira Transit Center, where refugees returning from the Goma area are initially processed. FHI participates in the screening of all new arrivals and identifies all separated children, families that have lost children, and especially vulnerable families. Photos of separated children and parents searching for children are posted in the office where vulnerable families are documented. FHI developed a database of all cases of family separation, including 226 people in Rwanda and 586 in Goma who were unintentionally separated during the forced repatriation. Copies were provided to both UNHCR and the ICRC, as well as the Goma office of FHI for follow up. FHI staff visit vulnerable families after they have returned to their commune of origin to further assess their situation and involve them in a local cooperative association (described above). Preventing the separation of children from families is one of the prime objectives of FHI's work at the commune and sector levels.

In Goma a campaign was carried out to inform parents and foster families how to prevent separations. Children under five years of age were provided tags or bracelets with their name, age, gender, tracing code (if in a foster family), and address. Interagency units were organized to work in strategic locations in the event of a large-scale movement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

ACTION CONCERNING THE CENTERS FOR SEPARATED CHILDREN

The following steps are needed to establish a strategy and plan for significantly reducing the number of centers for separated children and placing children in family care:

- A firm commitment by the GOR to the policy of reducing the numbers of centers and children in them and to the development of a plan for achieving this objective.
- A center-by-center review to profile the children living in each one (for example, age/sex breakdown, children's communes of origin, apparent need for tracing) and the centers themselves (for example, quality of care, desire of the managing organization to close, remain open, or reduce in size).
- Clear, realistic guidelines for foster placement and care by the GOR.
- A focal point for supporting and monitoring the implementation of the plan.
- A coordinated effort by donors (for example, USAID, UNICEF, UNDP, UNHCR) to support small-scale agricultural and economic initiatives, to give priority to poorer communities with large numbers of separated or reunited children.
- To strengthen family and community capacity to accept and provide care for vulnerable children through a coordinated effort by donors.

ASSESSMENT TEAM

If MINITRASO, MIFAPROFE, or MINIREISO believes that further consultation on these issues would be beneficial, USAID could arrange for an assessment, recommendations and periodic follow-up visits by two or three experienced professionals, planned and carried out in consultation with (and, if possible, with the participation of) senior personnel of key ministries. Such a visit might be planned in collaboration with UNICEF.

COORDINATION

Regular meetings, (perhaps monthly and convened by one of the ministries) are needed at the préfecture and national levels to promote information sharing and coordination among the ministries and NGOs involved with separated children. Participants should include MINIREISO, MINTRASO, and MIFAPROFE.

- the centers caring for separated children, and
- NGOs involved with IDTR, care and psychosocial well-being of separated children, prevention of separations, and foster care. Meetings should be participatory and task-oriented and involve two-way communication between the ministries and NGOs.

Meetings should be used to:

- develop a shared assessment of the situation and needs of separated children
- discuss and develop proposed policies
- generate awareness of and support for policies
- plan coordinated action.

Appendix 1
Scope Of Work

SCOPE OF WORK

Assessment of USAID funded projects and other issues
pertaining to separated and unaccompanied children.

Team: John Williamson and Cathy Savino

Consultancy Period: Consultants will visit Rwanda during the period January 27-February 10, 1996. During week one they will participant in the SCF (US) Children and War regional consultations. During week two the consultants will meet with government officials, UN agencies, ICRC and SCF (UK). It may be possible to also talk with other groups working with children, time permitting.

Reporting requirements: Assessment report will be submitted to the African Bureau manager of the Fund for Displaced Children and Orphans and the USAID/Rwanda mission. Findings will be shared with Save the Children (US) and Save the Children (UK).

The consultants will report on the status of the two USAID supported project with SCF (UK) and SCF (US) and provide an overview of the current status of approaches, attitudes and activities within the sector. These two objectives will overlap because of the inter-related nature of issues pertaining to children and the way the consultation will combine the SCF (US) consultations with a more traditional interviews and field trips.

SCF (US) will schedule all activities during the first week. The Mission will make appointments for week two after the consultants have arrived in country to avoid unnecessary duplication.

The assessment report should address the role and effectiveness of programs implemented by the five key groups listed below and provide recommendations to the Mission and the Africa Bureau regarding USAID's role in the sector and possible mission and/or DCOF funding.

1. Determine the effectiveness of the SCF(UK) Documentation, Tracing, and Reunification Program. (SCF has recently published a book on the DTR process and produced a video tape. A copy of each will be available in Kigali.) Areas of special interest include:

- impact of mass tracing activities (early efforts tried to trace the individual child based on descriptions provided by the child. This was effective, but slow. Mass tracing efforts try to pull a group of people who are looking for children together at the commune level in order speed up the reunification process. SCF will include you in one mass tracing meeting.)

- interplay between ICRC and SCF and the effectiveness of the

partnership

- time frame for continued DTR activities and plans for concluding the program.

- relationship/training role with other International and Rwandan NGOs supporting DTR activities

- assessment/perception of the GOR on DTR activities and the SCF/ICRC partnership

2. Determine progress against project objectives for the SCF(US) Psycho/social program.

- impact of the program in centers

- impact on foster family associations

- use of local NGO partners

- perception of the program by local government officials

- relationship of the psycho/social program and other SCF activities

- relationship to GOR ministries

3. Assess Government of Rwanda plans, efforts and capacity to assist separated children

- progress of the Inter-ministerial task force [Ministries of Labor and Social Affairs, Family and Women Promotion, Rehabilitation and Social Reintegration, Justice] assisted by SCF(UK) (terms of reference to be faxed)

- perceived role and program of each ministry--current activities, future plans, needs for increased capacity to implement future plans. (e-mail draft RFP for the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs.)

- government responsibility in representing and protecting children rights particularly in the areas of property rights and inheritance

- GOR policy regarding unaccompanied children and children's centers

4. Determine the effectiveness of UNICEF as the focal point for programs to assist unaccompanied children.

- effectiveness of UNICEF's coordination role

- UNICEF program and its relationship to implementing partners

(local and international NGOs.

future plans and funding levels

5. Describe some ways that Rwandan NGO's are participating in the sector and suggest ways in which Rwandan's can play a more prominent role.

- relationship between SCR (US), SCF (UK), UNICEF.

- plans to assist unaccompanied children and foster families.

In addition, to a review of these implementing groups and their activities, the following cross cutting issues should be explored at every level and with every agency:

- large scale fostering

 - emotional impact on foster parents and children,

 - economic consequences for the families

 - social safety net for foster families and children living alone

- children's centers

 - role in promoting or discouraging DTR activities

 - future place in the society [orphanages, community centers, closure]

 - ability to accommodate additional children during repatriation

- plans for large scale repatriation

 - reuniting families before repatriation

 - reuniting returnees with their children

 - plans to minimize separation during the repatriation process

- children living alone or in child-headed households

 - magnitude of the problem

 - community response to the needs of these children

 - coping mechanisms used by the children.

Appendix 2

Itinerary

Appendix 2: Itinerary

Jan. 29 CS, JW Attended the weekly staff meeting of the Save the Children staff and received an initial briefing by Safali Emanuel (National Project Director of the Psychosocial Assistance program of SC-US).

Met with Christine Hjelt (CH) to discuss priorities and schedule for visit. Met Jack Hjelt and Buddy Shanks (BS), who is expected to take over responsibility for the ADP from Ms. Hjelt.

With SC-US staff, visited the Ntarama church outside of Kigali, which was the site of a large scale massacre in April 1994.

30 JW Went to Butare Préfecture with Mr. Safali, Linile Malunga (SC-US Zimbabwe), Agostinho Mamade (National Director of the Children and War Program in Mozambique), and Damon Wilson (Project Officer for Information, Planning, and Reporting for SC-US).

In Butare's Ngoma Commune, visited the Félicité Marie and the St. Elizabeth centers for unaccompanied children.

In the Tumba community in Butare, met with representatives of the *Abadatenuha Urwejo* (Rwanda of Tomorrow) community association.

31 Met with representatives of *Abashiahamwe* (Those that Are Come Together) community association in the Ngoma-Matuguzo area, met the Sous-préfet, and visited the fish ponds and garden plots of the association.

In Gitarama Préfecture, Ruhango Commune, visited the sewing apprenticeship project and met with representatives of the *Mpuhezi Ababyeyi* community association.

Returned to Kigali and met with Ms. Rosemary Museminari, Director of Social Affairs, Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs.

Met with Mr. Jacques Kabale, Director of the Department of Families in the Ministry of Family and the Promotion of Women.

Feb. 1 Ms. Malunga and Mr. Mamade visited Kigali Prison and SC-US project there with Uwamaliya Landrada, SC-US Director of the

Rwanda Assessment Visit

Protégez-Moi project at the prison and David Archey,(SC-US, Limpkin Fellow)

CS, JW

Participated in a presentation at the bi-weekly coordination meeting on unaccompanied children at the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs.

Visited Foyer des Hirondelles, a center for unaccompanied children in Kigali, and talked with the SC-US staff assigned there, then visited the two community associations they have helped start in the Kimicanga area, their health center and garden plots.

Met with Ms. Hjelt to discuss the schedule for the visit.

2

Discussed social and cultural factors affecting programming in Rwanda with Mr. Zimmerman, Julie Dargis (SC-US Country Director) and members of the consultation team.

Met with Ms. Hjelt to discuss observations and programming issues.

Visited APABENA (Association for the Well-being of Unaccompanied Children) community association in Kigali's Kinamba area.

Briefed by Gilberte Dada Gahrabo (Regional Tracing Coordinator, SCF-UK) on the Documentaion, Tracing and Family Reunification Program of SCF-UK.

3 JW, CS, BS

Attended the debriefing of the SC-US staff from Mozambique and Zimbabwe.

Met with Bill Gray (Program Manager of SCF-UK) and Sara Hill (Tracing Coordinator of SCF-UK).

Discussed the draft RFA with Ms. Hjelt.

4 JW, CS

Met with Libby Grasse (Acting Country Director for FHI) for an overview of their program.

- JW Traveled to Giseny and met with Dan Curran (TAP Project Director for FHI)
- 5 Discussed FHI activities in Giseny with Mr. Curran and accompanied him to meet with FHI Sectuer Monitors in Mutura Commune, Nkamira Transit Center for returning refugees from the Goma area, met FHI Sectuer Monitors in Karago Commune, and met with Jean Pierre Camille (Bourgmestre of Karago).
- Returned to Kigali with Mr. Curran.
- 6 CS, JW, BS Traveled to Uganda Commune with Ms. Gahrabo for a scheduled mass tracing session that did not take place.
- CS, JW, BS, CH Briefed by Leila Gupta (UNICEF Trauma Coordinator) about the UNICEF Trauma Program, then discussed the UNICEF program for children in especially difficult circumstances with Laurie Calvo (head of UNICEF unit for CEDC) and Bertrand Desmoulins (Officer in charge for UNICEF Rwanda).
- 7 Discussed the revised draft RFA
- Met with Ms. Museminari, Gaspard ??? (MINITRASO), and Susthene Buscayne (USAID Rwanda), to discuss the revised draft RFA.
- Discussed income-generating initiatives with Ms. Calvo.
- 8 CS, JW, BS Met with MacKay Wolfe (UNHCR, Senior Program Officer and Regine Avogne (UNHCR, Community Services Officer).
- Met with Mitch Carlson and Francois Bucyano of UNDP.
- Met with Kate Crawford (USAID, Rwanda).
- CS, JW, BS, CH Debriefing with Jack Hjelt (Officer in Charge, USAID, Rwanda), Ms. Hjelt and Mr. Shanks.

Rwanda Assessment Visit

Met with Inymba Aloisea (Minister of Family and Women's Promotion), Kanyankore Marcel (Technical Advisor to the Minister of Family and Women's Promotion), ??? Vénantie, ??? (Director of Women's Promotion), and Odette ??? (Chef de Cabinet, MIFAPROFE).

- 9 CS Departure from Rwanda
- JW Traveled to Taba Commune in Gitarama with Mujawimana Jeanne (Development Assistant, WID, USAID) and met with Gotelieva Mukasrasi (Social Assistant, MINITRASO and founder of SEVOTA).
- JW, BS Briefed by Eva Jordung (Red Barnet) on their program in Kibungo Préfecturé.
- Met with Ms.Dargis and Mr. Zimmermann for a wrap-up discussion on the SC-US program.
- JW Discussion by telephone with Everett Ressler (Regional Advisor on Unaccompanied Children, UNICEF).
- 10 JW Met with Elizabeth Twinch (ICRC)
- JW, CJ. BS Met with Steve Rivkin (Country Director, SCF-UK)

Appendix 3

CENTRES POUR ENFANTS NON-ACCOMPAGNES

1er Décembre 1995							NOMBRE	NOMBRE
N°	NOM du CENTRE	PREFECT	COMMUN	DATE CREATION	NGO/AGENCE	ENFANT	REUNIFICATIONS	
1	Hôte Don Bosco-Cyotamakara	Butare	Nyabisindu	1990	Père Simon	108	pas d'information	
2	Hôte Don Bosco-Ruvubu	Butare	Gatagara	avril 1995	Père Simon	80	pas d'information	
3	Centre de CONCERN (eglise baptiste)	Butare	Buye	sout 1994	CONCERN	315	269 - RA & RS	
4	Orphelinat Antonin de Nyanza	Butare	Nyabisindu	1972	Congrégation Père Roux / AVSI	195	pas d'information	
5	Orphelinat Saint Elisabeth	Butare	Ngoma	1984	Association de la Fraternité	88	2 - RS	
6	Orphelinat de Sovu	Butare	Sovu	octobre 1984	Terre des Hommes	160	278 - RA & RS	
7	Sainte Croix / Tumba	Butare	Rango	octobre 1984	Terre des Hommes	150	471 - RA & RS	
8	Sainte Félité de Marie	Butare	Ngoma	decembre 1993	Diocèse de Butare / Caritas / SCF-US	50	pas d'information	
9	Feed the Children Centre de Transit	Butare	Ngoma	avril 1995	Feed the Children / Europe	159	424 - RA & RS	
10	Mugusa / Gikonko Centre ENA	Butare	Mugusa	avril 1995	Commune / Caritas / CRS	40	pas d'information	
11	Children's Welfare Mission Centre ENA	Butare	Ngoma	avril 1995	Richard Gasana / Dutch NGO / Caritas	48	0	
12	Intiganda	Butare	Ngoma	septembre 1989	Comité Paroissial / Caritas / PRS S.I	90	pas d'information	
13	Orphelinat Adventiste de Gakoni	Byumba	Murambi	1978	ADRA	223	pas d'information	
14	Orphelinat Village Urumuli	Byumba	Kibali	avril 1994	World Vision	134	186 - RA & RS	
15	SOS Ngarama	Byumba	Ngarama	mai 1994	SOS Kinderdorf International	175	84 - RS	
16	Noire Dame de la Route	Cyangugu	Kanombe	novembre 1994	Frères Jesuites	202	63 - RS	
17	Cité de la Miséricorde / Rusayo	Cyangugu	Gishoma	1979	Médecins du Monde	325	2 - RS	
18	Nyamashike / Kaganu Centre ENA	Cyangugu	Kagano	1994	German Emergency Doctors	122	pas d'information	
19	Kibogora / Kirambo Centre ENA	Cyangugu	Kirambo	1994	Eglise Méthodiste Libre	142	pas d'information	
20	Centre de Gatare	Gikongoro	Gatare		Caritas	47	pas d'information	
21	SOS Village d'Enfants	Gikongoro	Nyamagabe	juillet 1994	SOS Kinderdorf International	207	pas d'information	
22	Cyanika Centre ENA	Gikongoro	Cyanika	Août 1995	Caritas	40	0	
23	Centre d'Accueil et Unites de vie	Gisenyi	Rubavu	juillet 1994	MSF-Belgique	81	pas d'information	
24	Orphelinat Noël de Nyundo	Gisenyi	Rubavu	1995	Diocèse de Nyundo / SCF - USA	413	156 - RA & RS	
25	Centre ENA Mudende	Gisenyi	Mutara	1995	Roz Carr	38	pas d'information	
26	AAH Orphelinat	Gitarara	Cyeza	novembre 1994	Assoc. L'Action Humanitaire	59	113 - RA & RS	
27	Centre Gitarara (C.F.M.T.P)	Gitarara	Nyamabuye	juin 1994	CONCERN	179	60 - RA & RS	
28	Centre ENA Hanika	Gitarara	Kigoma	mai 1995	Association J.A	179	16 - RS	
29	Orphelinat de Byimana	Gitarara	Mukingi	1995	Jesus Alive Ministries	243	60 - RA & RS	
30	Centre ENA Kavumu Transit	Gitarara	Kavumu	avril 1995	Croix-Rouge Belgique	89	32 - RA	
31	Centre ENA Kamonyi Transit	Gitarara	Kamonyi	avril 1995	Croix-Rouge Belgique	126	21 - RA	
32	Centre de Gahini	Kibungo	Rukara	octobre 1994	Projet Suisse Rwanda	97	1 - RS	
33	Orphelinat Abatangana	Kibungo	Kibungo	juin 1994	Compassion International	193	6 - RS	
34	Centre Frew RWIGEMA	Kibungo	Rutonde	juillet 1994	International Rescue Committee / SCF -	148	54 - RA	
35	House of Joy	Kibungo	Birenga	1994	Missionnaire de la Charité	111	pas d'information	
36	Centre Amizero de Kibuye	Kibuye	Gitesi	juillet 1994	Enfants du Monde	14	411 - RA & RS	
37	Muganero Espérance	Kibuye	Gishyita	1995	ADRA / l'Esperance Children's Aid	95	20 - RA & RS	
38	Centre de MASAKA	Kigali - rurale	Kanombe	octobre 1994	Compassion International	260	pas d'information	
39	NYAMATA I et II (fusion)	Kigali - rurale	Kauzenze	avril 1994	CUAMM	265	403 - RA & RS	
40	Centre de Transit de Ndera	Kigali - rurale	Rubungu	juillet 1994	German Emergency Doctors	207	49 - RS	
41	Orphelinat Rubuha	Kigali - rurale	Ngenda	juillet 1994	World Vision	176	78 - RA & RS	
42	Samaritan's Child Village	Kigali - rurale	Kanombe	juin 1994	Samaritan's Purse	289	pas d'information	
43	Orphelinat Sans Frontières	Kigali - rural	Rushashi	1990	N. Dismas	15	pas d'information	
44	Association JA	Kigali - ville	Nyarugenge	octobre 1994	Association JA	278	17 - RA & RS	
45	Association Mémorial Gisimba	Kigali - ville	Nyarugenge	1980	Mém. Gisimba / Accueil Sans Frontières	111	18 - RS	
46	Chez Mariam (Ami des Orph. du Rwanda)	Kigali - ville	Nyamuramba	1994	Mariam / Assoc Familles d'Accueil	53	ENA mix en familles	
47	Centre de Congrégation des Fr. Josephites	Kigali - ville	Kicukiro	1995	Congrégation des Frères Josephites	40	pas d'information	
48	Centre Foyer Hirondelles	Kigali - ville	Kacyiru	juin 1989	AFRICARE / SCF-US / bienfaiteurs Suiss	104	102 - RS	
49	Centre de Kacyiru	Kigali - ville	Nyarugenge	1976	Croix Rouge de Belgique / SCF-USA	254	580 - RA & RS	
50	Mère du Verbe	Kigali - ville	Kacyiru	1990	AVSI du Rwanda en Italie	72	pas d'information	
51	Orphelinat Adventist	Kigali - ville	Kinshurura		Adventist Church	30	pas d'information	
52	Orphelinat Yatima	Kigali - ville	Nyarugenge	septembre 1993	Musulman	50	6 - RS	
53	Petites Soeurs de Jesus	Kigali - ville	Kicukiro	avril 1994	Congrégation des Petites Soeurs de Jesus	15	0	
54	Soeurs de Calcutta	Kigali - ville	Nyarugenge		Soeurs de Calcutta	113	14 - RS	
55	Village d'enfants SOS	Kigali - ville	Kacyiru	1979	SOS Kinderdorf International	158	4 - RS	
56	Hope and Care Centre ENA	Kigali - ville	Kicukiro	novembre 1994	Hope and Care Int'l / Sars Siendawula	54	0	
57	Soeurs Disciples Euchar. Centre ENA	Kigali - ville	Kicukiro	mai 1995	Soeurs Disciples de Jesus Eucharistique	310	10 (8 RA + 2 RS)	
58	Centre Umunyana	Kigali - ville	Nyarugenge	1995	Gasana Déo	30	pas d'information	
59	Maison Familiale (Mu rugo)	Kigali - ville	Kicukiro	1995	Madame JOJO	20	pas d'information	
60	Centre de Gasave	Kigali - ville	Kacyiru	1995	Particulier	24	pas d'information	
61	Centre ENA Gtare / Kidaho	Ruhengeri	Kidaho	1995	MSF	20	pas d'information	
62	Orphelinat Noire Dame / Neuba	Ruhengeri	Nyarutovu	novembre 1994	Fraternité Noire Dame	28	1 - RS	
63	Orphelinat de Janja	Ruhengeri	Nduna	1994	Soeurs Benébikira	39	2 - RS	
64	Orphelinat de Kigombe	Ruhengeri	Kigombe	1995	Soeurs Benébikira / CECI	205	pas d'information	
65	Centre de Transit SALEM	Ruhengeri	Kigombe	1995	Salem Germany	29	pas d'information	
						Nombre d'Enfants	8.303	
						Reunifications par les centres*	5.127	
						Nombre de Centres	66	
						* Ce chiffre comprend 1.114 réunifications spontanées notées dans		
						l'Evaluation des Centres fait par MINIREISO/UNICEF au mois de novembre 1994.		
						Ce chiffre ne donne pas la totalité des réunifications déjà réalisées qui est		
						de 12.409 mais montre le nombre de réunifications réalisées par les centres		
						ci-haut cités.		
						** Réunifications: Il y a deux principales méthodes: réunification active - RA		
						(par ONG ou employés du centre); et réunification spontanée - RS (par famille ENA)		
Evolution du Nombre d'Enfants dans les Centres:								
décembre 1994 - 10.381								
janvier 1995 - 11.458								
février 1995 - 12.493								
mars 1995 - 12.705								
avril 1995 - 12.361								
mai 1995 - 12.300								
juin 1995 - 12.088								
juillet 1995 - 11.567								
septembre 1995 - 9.777								
décembre 1995 - 8.303								
Sources: MINITRASO, UNICEF, CICR, SCF-UK, PAM, et autres ONGs								

Endnotes

Endnotes

1. In its December 1995 newsletter The Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs cited a total of 12,409 reunifications based on the reports of 19 NGOs (including Save the Children Fund-UK, plus the centers for separated children. It is not clear, however, how much duplication there may be among these reports.
2. Before April 1994 there were 37 "orphanages" in Rwanda with some 4,800 children in residence. Of these only 16 are still operating in the country while 50 have been established in response to the war and genocide. Centers established before April 1994 have also taken in additional children and increased in size.
3. David Tolfree, *Roofs and Roots: The Care of Separated Children in the Developing World*, Save the Children, Arena, Hants (England) and Brookfield (Vermont, USA), p. 83.
4. Ellen Balk-Dick, "Cost Comparison Between Children in Foster Care/Tracing Program and Children in Unaccompanied Children's Center," ADRA, Zaire, 1995.
5. Martha Ainsworth and A. A. Rwegarulira, "Coping with the AIDS Epidemic in Tanzania: Survivor Assistance," The World Bank, Africa Technical Department, Population, Health and Nutrition Division, Technical Working Paper No. 6, July 1992, p. 29.
6. WHO and UNICEF, 1994, pp. 63-69.
7. "Information Notes," UNHCR Regional Support Unit for Refugee Children, January 1996.
8. The two SC-US staff members assigned to the Center JA in Kigali after five months because the director refused to cooperate with IDTR. activities. Before they withdrew they trained two recreation specialists hired by the center. SC-US withdrew from the Nemba Center in Ruhengeri following a conflict of those who ran the center with local authorities. Subsequently the children living in that facility were moved to another center where SC-US staff were working.
9. Jan Williamson and Audrey Moser, International Social Service, Geneva, 1987, pp.56-57.